



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,235	12/22/2003	Michael N. Burdenko	8562-AFP/GDM	6984
20349	7590	11/04/2004	EXAMINER	
POLAROID CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT 1265 MAIN STREET WALTHAM, MA 02451				GHATT, DAVE A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,235	BURDENKO, MICHAEL N.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dave A Ghatt	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 4,5 and 9-11 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/23/2004.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 line 6 recites the structure, “said frame including *a* separate fork structure.”

[Emphasis added.] Claim 1 line 8 further states, “*each* said fork structure being adapted.”

[Emphasis added.] From line 8 it is clear that the applicant meant to claim a plurality of fork structures, as opposed to one fork structure recited in line 6. Line 6 should be amended to address this inconsistency.

Similarly, claim 1 line 11 recites, “a bias mechanism cooperatively associated with each fork structure.” Claim 2 lines 1-2 uses the language, “wherein *each* said bias mechanism is adapted to allow movement.” [Emphasis added.] From the claim 2 language it is clear that the applicant meant to claim a plurality of bias mechanisms, as opposed to one bias mechanism recited in claim 1 line 11. Line 11 should be amended to address this inconsistency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (US 6,682,239). As illustrated in Figures 8 and 9A-9D, Mori et al. teaches the claimed structure. Figure 8 shows a roller assembly, comprising a platen roller 100 including a central axle being exposed at opposite ends (generally indicated at 102) of said platen roller, and a frame 50 for mounting said platen 100 at both exposed axle ends. Figure 8 shows the frame including separate fork structured (55, 56) adapted for mounting each exposed axle end. Figures 9A-9D shows and column 9 lines 22-25 teach the structure where each fork structure is adapted to constrain a respective axle end from moving away from said frame. Column 10 lines 55-63 teach bias mechanisms cooperatively associated with each fork structure and being adapted to push said respective axle end away from the frame and against said fork structure in a direction X1. (See Figure 9D). The applicant should note that Figure 4 shows biasing mechanisms 83 and 84.

With respect to claim 2, and the requirement for each bias member to allow movement of a respective axle end towards the frame and against the bias mechanism, Figures 9A-9D show the allowance for movement against the bias mechanism and towards the frame.

With respect to claim 3, column 9 lines 20-22, and Figure 8 shows each axle with a bearing (102, 103). Column 9 lines 20-25 teach that each fork structure is adapted to retain the bearings. Figures 9A-9D shows the structure allowing movement of the bearing directly towards the frame.

With respect to claim 6, the stable locking arrangement illustrated in Figure 8 and outlined in column 9 lines 20-25, is adapted to constrain the bearings from lateral movement with respect to the frame.

With respect to claim 7, Figures 8 and 9A-9D shows each said fork structure having a pair of members extending from said frame and adapted to extend around opposite sides of a said bearing, similar to the structure taught by the applicant.

With respect to claim 8, Figures 8 and 9A-9D show each pair of members of said fork structure is separated by a first space having a sufficient size to allow a said bearing to pass axially therethrough.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 is indicated as having allowable subject matter because the prior art of record does not teach or render obvious the total combination claimed, wherein said bias mechanism comprises a bearing retainer which is biased away from said frame by said bias mechanism and adapted to engage said bearing.

Claim 9 is indicated as having allowable subject matter because the prior art of record does not teach or render obvious the total combination claimed, wherein one said fork structure of said frame has an additional spacing between said pair of members which additional spacing is sufficiently large enough to allow said platen roller to pass axially therethrough.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave A Ghatt whose telephone number is (571) 272-2165. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Friday 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAG



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800